

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

**BLANKET APPROVAL OF HISTORIC, TEMPORARY TRANSFERS
AND EXCHANGES OF
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT WATER BETWEEN
FRIANT WATER SERVICE CONTRACTORS**

SCCAO EA 00-05

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION**

**MID-PACIFIC REGION, SOUTH-CENTRAL CALIFORNIA AREA OFFICE
FRESNO, CALIFORNIA
MARCH 2000**

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION**

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

**BLANKET APPROVAL OF TEMPORARY TRANSFERS AND EXCHANGES
OF PROJECT WATER BETWEEN FRIANT WATER SERVICE
CONTRACTORS**

In accordance with the Section 102 (2) (c) of the National Environment Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, the South-Central California Area Office of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), has determined that the proposed action will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Furthermore, an environmental impact statement is not required. This Finding of No Significant Impact is supported by the attached Environmental Assessment, Number 00-05, *Blanket Approval of Temporary Transfers and Exchanges of Project Water Between Friant Water Service Contractors*, dated February 29, 2000 (BA), and is hereby incorporated by reference.

Implementing the proposed action would result in the annual approval of temporary transfers and exchanges of Central Valley Project (Project) water between existing Project water service contractors with access to the Friant Division Project facilities during each of the next five water years. This action is needed to improve water use and delivery efficiency and reduce annual administrative review.

The No Action Alternative would be the approval of transfers and exchanges with annual administrative review as is currently done. The option of releasing water into the San Joaquin River for exchange or transfer to wildlife refuges was considered but rejected because there are no re-diversion points along the river.

Based on the analyses and conclusions of the EA, Reclamation determines that the proposed action is neither precedent setting, controversial, nor an action usually requiring an Environmental Impact Statement.

This determination is supported by the following factors summarized from the EA:

1. Water Resources. The Proposed action would not result in any change in existing CVP operations. Water would be used for irrigation purposes only on lands irrigated within the last three years. Water would be delivered to established cropland.
2. Land use. Land use would not change. No native grassland or shrub land would be tilled or cultivated. Water would be conveyed through existing facilities with no construction or modification to existing facilities.

3. Biological Resources. No federally listed or endangered species would be adversely affected. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has concurred with this determination. Reclamation will continue to implement commitments made under the October 15, 1991 Biological Opinion for the Friant Division Water Service Contract Renewals.

Recommended:	<u>/s/ Paula J. Landis</u> Chief, Resource Management Division South-Central California Area Office	<u>3/13/00</u> Date
Concur:	<u>/s/ David K. Young</u> Environmental Officer South-Central California Area Office	<u>3/10/00</u> Date
Approved: for	<u>/s/ Michael Jackson</u> Area Manager South-Central California Area Office	<u>3/13/00</u> Date

FONSI No.: SCCAO FONSI 00-05

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

BLANKET APPROVAL OF HISTORIC TEMPORARY TRANSFERS AND EXCHANGES OF PROJECT WATER BETWEEN FRIANT WATER SERVICE CONTRACTORS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) proposes an expeditious process to approve historic temporary transfers and exchanges of Central Valley Project (Project) water within the eastern San Joaquin Valley if certain criteria designed to ensure minimal impacts are met. Transfers or exchanges which do not meet these criteria would be evaluated under separate National Environmental Policy Act documents. The proposal extends an on going and historic program of minor transfers and exchanges which are prepared annually. The proposal differs from the existing annual approval process and environmental analysis by extending the duration of impact analysis for up to five years, a step which is being taken to reduce administrative costs. The proposal is authorized by, and would be in full compliance with, Section 3405(a) of Public Law 102-575, Title 34, the Central Valley Project Improvement Act.

2.0 PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the proposed action is to expedite historic transfers and exchanges of Project water between Friant CVP contractors. Typically, these transfers and exchanges are scheduling adjustments between contractors or are made for more efficient water management. They are small, temporary, and low impact. Requests for these exchanges and transfers have been approved on an annual basis for over 40 years. Since 1992, environmental assessments and FONSI's have been prepared. However, the administrative and environmental review process requires several months for each request. This causes higher costs, uncertainty in delivery, deficiency in contract supply, and delays in efficient water use. Thus in order to lower costs and ensure efficient water supply and use, a blanket approval process is needed.

3.0 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVE

3.1 Proposed Action

The proposed action is to implement a five year blanket approval process for the temporary transfer or exchange of Project water either between Friant CVP contractors (Appendix A) for irrigation purposes. Each approved transfer or exchange would be historic, routine, valid for a single water year and may be renewed annually for five years between March 13, 2000 and February 28, 2005. The total amount of water delivered annually would be limited to 150,000 acre feet. Project water would be transferred and/or exchanged through existing Friant facilities (Friant-Kern Canal and Madera Canal); deliveries would be monitored and annually reported. Only one environmental assessment would be prepared for the five year period. The amount of water would be limited to the existing supply and would not be approved if it increased overall consumptive use.

Criteria have been developed that would ensure that no effects would occur to any listed or unlisted fish and wildlife species or critical habitats. The following criteria would apply to every delivery and are incorporated in the proposed action. Each transfer or exchange:

1. Would be used for irrigation purposes on lands irrigated within the last three years, or groundwater recharge. Water would be delivered to established cropland or groundwater basins. No conversion of grassland or shrub land to agricultural land would occur.
2. Would occur within a single water year.
3. Would be effective between March 2000 and February 2005 on a willing seller and willing buyer basis.
4. Would convey water through existing facilities with no new construction or modifications to facilities.
5. Would comply with all Federal, State, Local, or Tribal law or requirements imposed for protection of the environment and Indian Trust Assets.

3.2 No Action Alternative

The No-Action Alternative would continue the current approval process for temporary transfers and exchanges on an annual case-by-case basis, with separate environmental analysis and administrative review.

3.3 Alternative Considered but Rejected

Reclamation considered acquiring Project water to meet obligations for environmental restoration. The Project water would be released to the San Joaquin River for delivery to wildlife refuges in the Friant Division. This Project water would satisfy requirements of CVPIA to acquire water for California refuges. However, Reclamation does not have points of diversion or re-diversion under the existing Friant permit. Therefore, Friant Project water cannot be obtained for the refuges.

3.4 Actions Common to Proposed Action and No Action Alternative

On October 15, 1991, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) issued the *Biological Opinion for the Friant Division Water Contract Renewals*. The Service determined that the renewal of these contracts, which included transfers and exchanges, would not jeopardize the continuing existence of 14 species of plants and wildlife listed as Threatened or Endangered under the Endangered Species Act. The conclusions and terms and conditions of the Biological Opinion is hereby incorporated by reference.

4.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

4.1 Terrestrial Resources

The Project diverts water from Millerton Lake at Friant Dam to irrigate more than 1.0 million acres of crops. Most of the agricultural lands are permanent fruit and nut orchards and vineyards that are irrigated with high efficiency sprinkler systems. There are a wide variety of

other annual crops like cotton, alfalfa, melons, tomatoes, and vegetables. Water Service Contractors (Contractors) are identified in Appendix A of this environmental document. Contractors within the Friant Division are described in the *Biological Assessment for the Proposed Friant Contract Renewal, April 24, 1991* and *Supplement to the Biological Assessment for the Proposed Friant Division Contractor Renewals, June 14, 1991* (BAs). Descriptions in the BAs are hereby incorporated by reference into the Affected Environment of this environmental assessment

4.2 Aquatic Resources

The average allocation of Project water available each year for Friant Division water service contractors is 1,400,000 acre feet and is based on the storage of winter precipitation and control of spring runoff in the San Joaquin River basin. The schedule of Project water conveyed through Reclamation facilities is determined by state water rights permits, judicial decisions, and state/federal obligations to maintain water quality, enhance environmental conditions, and prevent flooding. The allocation of Project water to the Friant Division water service contractors is determined by water service contracts and the capacity of Project storage and conveyance facilities.

Project water is used for reasonable and beneficial purposes but is generally not sufficient for all needs. In the service area Contractors without sufficient surface water, pump from groundwater sources which causes overdraft conditions and subsidence. Shallow aquifers have been contaminated by irrigation runoff, pesticides, and soluble, naturally occurring trace elements like selenium, boron, and arsenic.

During the winter months, farmers use water for frost control and to pre-irrigate fields and saturate the top five feet of soil prior to planting. This loosens the soil for plowing and provides enough moisture to seeds for successful germination. Though most precipitation falls during the winter and early spring, this amount is usually not sufficient. In the late summer, the need for irrigation water is greatest.

4.3 Wildlife and Special Status Species

The Valley currently supports approximately 250 species of birds, a variety of mammals, and several Federal listed, proposed, and candidate species, such as the American peregrine falcon, bald eagle, Aleutian Canada goose, San Joaquin kit fox, giant garter snake, and white-faced ibis.

The Service issued its October 15, 1991, Biological Opinion describing the effects of the renewal of Friant Division Project water service contracts on listed species. The Service determined that the long-term renewal of the contracts would not jeopardize the continued existence of 14 listed species inhabiting the Friant service area and the San Joaquin Valley (Table 1). Reclamation committed to implement a valley-wide endangered species conservation program to protect these species from harmful effects of land-use conversion, agricultural pesticide use, and related activities. This commitment was required again in the February 27, 1995, Biological Opinion for the Interim Renewal of 67 Water Service Contracts of the Central Valley Project.

**Table 1. Listed Endangered and Threatened Species That May Occur
in South of Delta Contractor Area.**

Common Name	Scientific Name	Habitat	Status
Invertebrates			
bald eagle	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	Millerton Lake	Endangered
valley elderberry longhorn beetle	<i>Desmocerus californicus dimorphus</i>	riparian	Threatened
Aleutian Canada geese	<i>Branta canadensis leucopareia</i>	wetlands	Threatened
blunt-nosed leopard lizard	<i>Gambelia silus</i>	San Joaquin saltbush, valley grassland	Endangered
Fresno kangaroo rat	<i>Dipodomys nitratoides exilis</i>	San Joaquin saltbush, valley grassland	Endangered
Tipton kangaroo rat	<i>Dipodomys nitratoides nitratides</i>	San Joaquin saltbush, valley grassland	Endangered
giant kangaroo rat	<i>Dipodomys ingens</i>	San Joaquin saltbush, valley grassland	Endangered
San Joaquin kit fox	<i>Vulpes macrotis mutica</i>	California prairie, San Joaquin saltbush, valley grassland	Endangered
palmate-bracted bird's beak	<i>Cordylanthus palmatus</i>	San Joaquin saltbush, valley grassland	Endangered
Bakersfield cactus	<i>Opuntia treleasei</i>	San Joaquin saltbush, valley grassland	Endangered
Hoover's wooly-star	<i>Eriastrum hooveri</i>	San Joaquin saltbush, valley grassland	Threatened
San Joaquin wooly-threads	<i>Lembertia congdonii</i>	alkali (Chernopod) scrub, grassland	Endangered
Kern mallow	<i>Eremalche kernensis</i>	San Joaquin saltbush, valley grassland	Endangered
California jewelflower	<i>Caulanthus californicus</i>	San Joaquin saltbush, valley grassland	Endangered

Reference U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, October 15, 1991, Biological Opinion for the Friant Water Contract Renewals.

The bald eagle may be delisted in July 2000 and removed from protection under the Endangered Species Act.

The 1991 Biological Opinion specifies how water should be delivered to most of the Friant Division Project water service contractors to avoid jeopardy to endangered and threatened species and requires Reclamation to develop and implement a long-term program to address the needs of listed endangered species in the San Joaquin Valley. The program has four components:

1. The Service, with Reclamation's cooperation, developed a Critical Needs Plan that identified those species requiring immediate protection to assure their continued existence in the San Joaquin Valley.

2. The Service developed a comprehensive recovery plan that included upland species listed as endangered species in the San Joaquin Valley. The Critical Needs Plan was incorporated into the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California*, dated September 30, 1998 (Plan). Reclamation assisted in development of the Plan and is committed to its implementation to the extent of their authority.
3. Reclamation is, as a component of a broader program, implementing items identified in the Plan that are Reclamation's responsibility. Reclamation cooperated in conducting the population variability analysis.
4. Reclamation has developed and implemented a Cooperative Agreement to include entities whose activities affect listed species in the San Joaquin Valley. Cooperative efforts have resulted in cost savings for participating entities and a more uniform and coordinated effort toward species recovery.

4.4 Archeological and Cultural Resources

Cultural resources is a broad term that includes prehistoric, historic, architectural and traditional cultural properties. The San Joaquin Valley is rich in historical and pre-historic cultural resources. Prior to the 18th Century, many Native American tribes inhabited the Central Valley. It is possible that cultural resources lie undiscovered across the valley floor. It is unlikely they are within the right of way of existing facilities.

4.5 Indian Trust Assets

Indian Trust Assets are legal interests in property or rights held in trust by the United States for Indian Tribes or individual Native Americans. Trust status originates from rights imparted by treaties, statutes, or executive orders. Such assets cannot be sold, leased or otherwise alienated without federal approval.

Indian reservations, rancherias, and allotments are common Indian Trust Assets. Allotments are parcels of land held in trust for specific individuals that may be located outside reservation boundaries. In addition, such assets include the right to access certain traditional areas and perform traditional ceremonies.

4.6 Environmental Justice

The February 11, 1994, Executive Order 12898 was signed which requires federal agencies to ensure that their actions do not disproportionately impact minority and disadvantaged populations. The market for seasonal workers on local farms draws thousands of migrant workers, commonly of Hispanic origin from Mexico and Central America. The population of some small communities typically increases during late summer harvest, overwhelming local water and sewage facilities and causing public health problems. The service area of the Friant Division has a stable economy based on intensely developed irrigated agriculture. The crops are predominately citrus, nuts, and grapes.

4.7 Socio-Economic Resources

The Project water service area of the Friant Division is primarily rural agricultural land. There are many communities across the area that are homes for farm workers. There are many

small businesses that support agriculture like feed and fertilizer sales, machinery sales and service, pesticide applicators, transport, packaging, marketing, etc.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

5.1 Terrestrial Resources

5.1.1 Proposed Action

Under the proposed action water would be transferred or exchanged between Contractors on an annual basis and approved annually during the five year period. Environmental reviews would not be done for each approval. As a result delays in water use and delivery would be avoided. Because water deliveries could be rescheduled deficiencies in supply would be reduced.

No farm or urban lands would be annexed into the Friant Division service area to specifically use this water.

5.1.2 No Action Alternative

Transfers and exchanges would be analyzed on a case-by-case basis, each requiring a review of the legal, technical, and environmental aspects of each transfer would hinder flexibility and discourage transfers. As a result Reclamation may not be able to approve each proposal in a timely manner which would cause a delay in water deliveries. Without an efficient ability to transfer or exchange water, Project water may be applied in excess to some fields or lost from use by farmers.

5.2 Aquatic Resources

5.2.1. Proposed Action

The proposed action would result in up to 150,000 acre feet or 1.07 percent of the average annual allocation being transferred or exchanged between Friant contractors during a single water year. Water would be conveyed in existing Reclamation facilities and would not affect existing diversion points. Re-allocation of Project water between contractors would balance deficiencies. In turn this would reduce the need for groundwater pumping.

5.2.2 No Action Alternative

The affects would be similar to those described in Section 5.1.2. In addition, Contractors would temporarily use more groundwater. In turn this would contribute to existing over-draft conditions and subsidence.

Without an efficient ability to transfer, Project water may be applied in excess to some fields or lost from use by farmers. Flood control releases from the Millerton Lake end up in the San Joaquin River and the Delta benefitting riparian habitat and downstream water users.

5.3 Wildlife and Special Status Species

5.3.1 Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, no native, unfilled lands would be cultivated, tilled and irrigated with transferred or exchanged Project water. Project water would be delivered to established cropland or groundwater recharge basins. Since there is no change to existing habitat there would be no affects to plants or wildlife species.

Under the proposed action, Reclamation*s approval would be conditioned with the following terms:

“The Endangered Species Notice to the Friant Division Water Service Contractors noted that some types of surface disturbing activities would require consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service. The intent is that irrigation activities not affect the presence of threatened or endangered species. Grasslands and shrub land that have never been tilled or irrigated must not be tilled and put into agricultural production using this water. If the land has been fallow for three consecutive years or more, we must inspect it for endangered species.”

Therefore no grassland or shrub land would be tilled or irrigated. Since no surface disturbance occur, no species listed or proposed to be listed as endangered or threatened, would be affected. The Service concluded in a memorandum, dated March 7, 2000, that the proposed action would not likely adversely affect listed species.

5.3.2 No Action and Reasonable Alternatives

Affects are the same as those described in the proposed action.

5.4 Archeological and Cultural Resources

5.4.1 Proposed Action

The availability of this Project water would not affect any cultural resources because the Project water would be conveyed in existing facilities and canals to established agricultural land. No excavation or construction is required to convey the Project water and no unfilled land would be cultivated to use the Project water.

5.4.1 No Action Alternative

Affects are the same as those described in the proposed action.

5.5 Indian Trust Assets

5.5.1 Proposed Action

Indian Trust assets are known to exist within the Friant Division Project water service area, however, no impacts to them would occur under the proposed action.

5.5.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action alternative would not interfere with the observation of religious or other ceremonies associated with Indian Trust assets.

5.6 Environmental Justice

5.6.1 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would not cause any harm to minority or disadvantaged populations within the Friant Division Project water service area. A transfer of Project water would allow the contractor to supplement the water supply in its service area. The availability of this Project water for the contract would maintain agricultural production and employment if the next year is a dry year. A dependable water supply allows farmers to maintain permanent orchards that require much field labor for pruning and harvest.

5.6.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action alternative would make it difficult, but not impossible, for the contractor to use this supplemental Project water. Without supplemental Project water, some field crops may not be planted or orchards may be stressed. Alternative current employment and housing trends would remain unchanged in the service area with the No Action alternative.

5.7 Socio-Economic Resources

5.7.1 Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action alternative, the contractor could rely on its supply of non-project water for irrigation use. There should be no significant social or economic problems. Seasonal labor requirements would not change, and businesses that support agriculture would not be financially harmed.

Neither alternative would cause any harm to the quality of the human environment nor have significant adverse effects on public health or safety. The contractor is responsible for obtaining and managing water for the benefit of its members in consideration of local economic conditions and employment.

5.7.2 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action alternative, the contractor would rely solely on its individual allocation of Project water which varies each year.

5.8 Cumulative Effects

5.8.1 Proposed Action

Under the proposed action, each transfer or exchange is temporary. Therefore, the duration of each transfer and exchange would limit any cumulative impacts. The contractors are not likely to sponsor Project water transactions that harm local operations. The blanket approval would not establish a precedent for future actions, but would provide more data on water marketing. Blanket approval would simplify the review and approval process for transfers, affording the

contractors the flexibility to best manage the finite supply of Project water. Reclamation has determined that there would be no significant cumulative effects to Project operations from the proposed action.

Table 2 is a summary of the environmental affects of this proposed action.

Resource	Proposed Action	No Action	Past Action	Future Action	Cumulative Effects
Physical	None	None	None	None	None
Biological	None	None	None	None	None
Cultural	None	None	None	None	None
Socio-Economic	None	None	None	None	None

As previously noted, the approval would occur for each of the next five water years and would be limited to uses of this Project water and cause no land conversions.

5.8.2 No Action Alternative

Affects are the same as those described in the proposed action.

6.0 ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

Other than proper consultation and coordination with listed agencies, there are no specific activities and measures that are to result from this action to improve or enhance the environment. The availability of this Project water would not result in the cultivation of native untitled land in the Contractor*s service area.

7.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

Reclamation collaborated with the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) in developing this temporary water transfer and exchange program. No consultation under the Endangered Species Act with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) was required for this transfer agreement because Reclamation determined this program would not affect any listed species under the jurisdiction of NMFS.

For the Service, this determination is based on similar rationale for aquatic species under Service*s jurisdiction. For terrestrial species, Reclamation has also determined that the program would not affect any listed species. Reclamation has, nonetheless, requested concurrence with its determination of no effect and not likely to adversely affect listed species from the Service.

Reclamation circulated the draft EA for this proposed action to all Friant Division contractors and other interested parties who had previously expressed interest in water transfer activity.

Transfers authorized under this program would be posted on the Internet at a site linked to Reclamation*s web site at www.mp.usbr.gov.

FISH AND WILDLIFE COORDINATION ACT (16 USC sec. 651 et seq.)

The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act requires that Reclamation consult with fish and wildlife agencies (federal and state) on all water development projects that could affect biological resources. No significant, unmitigable impacts to wildlife would occur under the Proposed Action and no further coordination/consultation would be needed with the Service or the California Department of Fish and Game.

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT (16 USC Sec.1521 et seq.)

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act requires federal agencies, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, to ensure that their actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of endangered or threatened species, or result in the destruction or adverse modification of the critical habitat of these species. As discussed in Section 4.3 of this environmental assessment, Reclamation has concluded that the proposed action would not affect any listed or proposed for listing threatened or endangered species. The Biological Opinion for the Friant Division Water Contract Renewals (October 15, 1991) requires that Reclamation consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service on any new water contracts involving the Friant Division facilities. Reclamation is consulting with the Service. The Service concluded that the project would not likely adversely affect listed threatened and endangered species. However, the conclusion, predicated on the lack of information on long-term effects of this program, requires that Reclamation reinitiate consultation in one year.

NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT (15 USC Sec. 470 et seq.)

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to evaluate the effects of federal undertakings on historical, archeological and cultural resources. No features or resources have been identified that could be affected by the Proposed Action.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11988 - FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT AND EXECUTIVE ORDER 11990 - PROTECTION OF WETLANDS

Executive Order 11988 requires federal agencies to prepare floodplain assessments for actions located within or affecting flood plains, and similarly, Executive Order 11990 places similar requirements for actions in wetlands. The Proposed Action would not affect floodplains or wetlands.

REFERENCES

- Blanket Approval of Temporary Transfers and Exchanges of CVP Water Between Friant Division Contractors During the Interim Period Environmental Assessment U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, March, 1997.
- Biological Opinion for the Friant Division Water Contract Renewals, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento, California, October, 1991.
- Considering Cumulative Effects Under The National Environmental Policy Act, Council on Environmental Quality, January, 1997

**Project Water Service Contractors
With Access to Friant Division Project Facilities**

Friant-Kern Canal

Arvin-Edison Water Storage District
Delano-Earlimart Irrigation District
Exeter Irrigation District
Fresno Irrigation District
Garfield Water District
International Water District
Ivanhoe Irrigation District
Lewis Creek Water District
Lindmore Irrigation District
Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation District
Lower Tule River Irrigation District
Orange Cove Irrigation District
Porterville Irrigation District
Saucelito Irrigation District
Shafter-Wasco Irrigation District
Southern San Joaquin Municipal Utility District
Stone Corral Irrigation District
Tea Pot Dome Water District
Terra Bella Irrigation District
Tulare Irrigation District
City of Fresno
City of Lindsay
City of Orange Cove

Madera Canal

Chowchilla Water District
Madera Irrigation District

Cross Valley Canal

County of Fresno
County of Tulare
Hill's Valley Irrigation District
Kern-Tulare Water District
Lower Tule River Irrigation District
Pixley Irrigation District
Rag Gulch Water District
Tri-Valley Water District

Millerton Lake

Fresno County Waterworks District #18
Gravelly Ford Water District
County of Madera

Other Federal Contractors

Cawelo Water District
Consolidated Irrigation District
Deer Creek & Tule River Authority
Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District
Kings County Water District
Kern County Water Agency
Lakeside Irrigation Water District
Liberty Water District
Semitropic Water Storage District
North Kern Water Storage District
Rosedale-Rio Bravo Water Storage District
Buena Vista water Storage District